arXiv:1602.03690v1 [math.LO] 11 Feb 2016

CONSTRUCTING A WEAK SUBSET OF A RANDOM SET

LU LIU

Abstract. The tree forcing method given by [8] enables the cone avoiding of strong enumeration of a given tree, within a subset or co-subset of an *arbitrary* given set, provided the given tree does not admit computable strong enumeration. Using this result, we settled and reproduced a series of problems in reverse mathematics. In this paper, we demonstrate cone avoiding results within an infinite subset of a given 1-random set. We show that for any given 1-random set X, there exists an infinite subset Y of X such that Y does not compute any real with positive effective Hausdorff dimension, thus answering negatively a question posed by Kjos-Hanssen that whether there exists a 1-random set of which any infinite subset computes some 1-random real. The result is surprising in that the tree forcing technique used on the subset or co-subset seems to heavily rely on subset co-subset combinatorics, whereas this result does not.

1. Introduction

Extracting randomness under various conditions has drawn attention from computability theorists. In [5, 4], Kjos-Hanssen studied the problem of extracting randomness within an infinite subset of a given 1-random real. Though the original guess is that an infinite subset of a 1-random real can be computed, Miller [9] showed that there exists some 1/2 effective Hausdorff dimension real from which no 1-random real can be computed, thus separating the computability theoretic strength (Muchnick degree) between the two classes.

There is another view on extracting randomness arising from reverse mathematics. Some questions concern whether some arithmetic statements imply WWKL. Proving that some arithmetic statements do not imply WWKL involves constructing a set under some conditions while avoiding the computation of any 1-random reals. [1] separated DNR from WWKL, and the result was reproved in [8]. The method of [8] proved that if a tree does not admit strong enumeration, then for an *arbitrary* set A, there exists an infinite subset or co-subset of A that also does not compute a strong enumeration of that tree (and thus does not compute a path of that tree). Because the tree defining WWKL does not admit computable strong enumeration, the result therefore implies that RT^2_2 does not imply WWKL and also implies that there exists some DNR that does not compute any real with positive effective Hausdorff dimension. As far as we know, there is no natural example of a tree that does not admit a computable path while admitting computable strong enumeration.

In this paper, we modify a part of the proof of the method in [8] to show that every 1-random real admits an infinite subset that does not compute any 1-random

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 68Q30 ; Secondary 03D32 03D80 28A78.

Key words and phrases. recursion theory, computability theory, computability randomness theory, Mathias forcing.

real. The result is interesting because it seems that the combinatorial argument in [8] relies heavily on the fact that $A\ \overline{A}$ is a partition of ω.

There is also an ongoing research in reverse mathematics that seek to construct "weak" (in various sense) solution of some problem [3] [10][11] [6]. It is hopeful that our method can be adapt to construct "weak" solution within certain random instance.

We end this section by giving some definitions and the main result.

In the following text, we fix a universal prefix free machine U and let $K_U(\rho)$ denote the corresponding Kolmogorov complexity of $\rho \in 2^{<\omega}$.

Definition 1.1. A set A is effectively compressible iff there exists a computable function $f : \omega \to \omega$ such that $K_U(A \upharpoonright f(n)) \leq f(n) - n$.

Definition 1.2 (Beigela et.al [2])**.** Fix the canonical representation of the finite set. Each finite set is denoted by D_n, where n is the (canonical) index of this finite set. For a subset of $2^{<\omega}$ X, a k-enumeration of X is a function h such that

$$(\forall n)|D_{h(n)}| \leq k \wedge D_{h(n)} \cap X \neq \emptyset \wedge (\forall \rho \in D_{h(n)})|\rho| \geq n \tag{1.1}$$

A finite enumeration of X is a k-enumeration of X for some k.

For the sake of notational simplicity, for a tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$, we define a strict k-enumeration of T to be a function such that

$$(\forall n)|D_{h(n)}| \leq k \wedge D_{h(n)} \cap T \neq \emptyset \wedge (\forall \rho \in D_{h(n)})|\rho| = n \tag{1.2}$$

It is clear that a strict k-enumeration of a tree can be computed from a k-enumeration of that tree $h(\cdot)$.

Theorem 1.3. *A is not effectively compressible, and let $[Q^n]$, $n \in \omega$, be a sequence of Π^0_1 class such that none of Q^n admits computable finite enumeration. Then, there exists an infinite subset of A, namely G, such that none of Q^n admits finite enumeration computable in G.*

Corollary 1.4. *For any 1-random real A, there exists an infinite subset of A, namely G, such that G does not compute any real with positive effective Hausdorff dimension.*

Proof. The corollary follows by noting that the sequence of trees defining "effective Hausdorff dimension reals" do not admit computable finite enumeration. □

Section 2 introduces the forcing conditions. We introduce the requirements that we use in section 3, and a general scheme of the proof is also described there. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of the lemmas related to the main technique.

2. Forcing conditions

We begin by reviewing Mathias forcing and the forcing conditions introduced in [8, 7].

Let $X \in 2^\omega$ code an ordered k-partition iff

- $X = X_0 \oplus X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_{k-1}$ and
- $\cup_{i=0}^{k-1} X_i = \omega$

A class P is a k-partition class iff $\forall X \in P$, X codes an ordered k-partition.

Definition 2.1.

- A Mathias condition is a pair (σ, X) with $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ and $X \in 2^\omega$.
- (τ, Y) extends the Mathias condition (σ, X) iff $\sigma \preceq \tau$ and $Y/\tau \subseteq X/\sigma$. Write $(\tau, Y) \leq (\sigma, X)$ to denote the extension relation.
- A set G satisfies the Mathias condition (σ, X) if $\sigma \prec G$ and $G \subseteq X/\sigma$.

Definition 2.2.
Here and below, a condition is a tuple as follows: $(k, \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{k-1}, P)$, where $k > 0$, each $\sigma_i \in 2^{<\omega}$, and P is a Π^0_1 k-partition class.

We regard each $X_0 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_{k-1} \in P$ as representing k many Mathias conditions (σ_i, X_i) for $i < k$.

Definition 2.3.
We say that $d = (m, \tau_0, \ldots, \tau_{m-1}, Q)$ extends $c = (k, \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{k-1}, P)$, denoted by $d \leq c$, iff there is a function $f : m \to k$ satisfying
$(\forall i < m\, \forall Y_0 \oplus \cdots \oplus Y_{m-1} \in Q)\, (\exists X_0 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_{k-1} \in P)$ s.t. $(\tau_i, Y_i) \leq (\sigma_{f(i)}, X_{f(i)})$.
In this case, we say that

- f witnesses this extension;
- part i of d refines part $f(i)$ of c.

Definition 2.4. We say that G satisfies $(k, \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{k-1}, P)$ iff there is an $X_0 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_{k-1} \in P$ such that G satisfies some (σ_i, X_i).
In this case, we also say that G satisfies $(k, \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{k-1}, P)$ *on part* i.

Definition 2.5. We say that d forces a requirement R on part j iff every G satisfying d on part j also satisfies requirement R. d *forces* R iff it forces R on each of its parts.

3. Frame of the proof

The infinite set G that we construct will satisfy the following requirements. By abusing notation, we regard an integer (or output of a Turing machine) as the finite set it represents in canonical form and use $\rho \in x$, $x \cap y$ for the corresponding set theoretic notations.

Definition 3.1. $R^n_e : \Phi_e^{(G \cap A)}$ is not a strict $e-$enumeration of Q^n, i.e., one of the following is true:

- $\Phi_e^{(G \cap A)}$ is not total;
- $(\exists n) \Phi_e^{(G \cap A)}(n) \cap Q^n = \emptyset$;
- $(\exists n) |\Phi_e^{(G \cap A)}(n)| > e$;
- $(\exists n)\ \rho \in \Phi_e^{(G \cap A)}(n), |\rho| \neq n$

P_e: $|G \cap A| > e$.

Finally, $G \cap A$ is clearly an infinite subset of A (because G satisfies all $P_e, e \in \omega$) that does not compute any strong enumeration of Q^n for any $n \in \omega$.

We will construct a sequence of conditions $c_s \geq c_{s+1}$, $c_s = (d_s, \tau^s_1, \cdots, \tau^s_{r_s}, Q_s)$, such that for every e, $c_{2<e,n>}$ forces R^n_e and c_{2e+1} forces P_e on its acceptable parts, and $Q_s \neq \emptyset$, where

Definition 3.2. Part i of condition $c = (k, \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{k-1}, P)$ being acceptable implies that $(\exists X_0 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_{k-1} \in P)$ such that $X_i/\sigma_i \cap A$ is infinite.

To obtain the desired G, we consider the acceptable parts of the above conditions c_s forming a tree under the refinement relation. Nodes on level s of the tree represent parts of condition c_s. Node j is a child of i iff for some s, j belongs to level $s+1$, i belongs to level s, and $f_{s+1}(j) = i$ where f_{s+1} is the witness of relation $c_{s+1} \leq c_s$ (see definition 2.3).

This tree is finitely branching and infinite (because by lemma 3.3, every condition has an acceptable part, and if a part is not acceptable, all its successors are not acceptable), and therefore, the tree has an infinite path, i.e., there are $i_0, i_1, \ldots$ such that every s acceptable part i_{s+1} of c_{s+1} refines acceptable part i_s of c_s. Let $G = \bigcup_s \sigma^s_{i_s}$; we argue that G satisfies each c_s. Let $U_s = \{Y : Y \text{ satisfy } (\sigma^s_{i_s}, X_{i_s}) \text{ for some } X_0 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_{k_s-1} \in P_s\}$. Because part i_{s+1} refines part i, clearly, $U_0 \supseteq U_1 \supseteq \cdots$. Because part i_s of c_s is acceptable, $(\forall s) U_s \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, U_s are all closed. Thus, G is the unique member of $\cap^\infty_{s=0} U_s$, and clearly, G satisfies each c_s.

Let the initial condition be $c_0 = (1, \varepsilon, P_0)$, where ε is the empty string and $P_0 = \{\omega\}$. Then, the proof of theorem 1.3 is reduced to the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.3. *For every condition $c = (k, \tau_1, \cdots, \tau_{k-1}, P)$ and every $m \in \omega$, if $P \neq \emptyset$ (which implies c must admit some acceptable parts because P is a partition class), then there is a condition $d \leq c$ such that d forces P_m on each acceptable part of d.*

Lemma 3.4. *For every condition $c = (k, \tau_1, \cdots, \tau_{k-1}, P)$, $P \neq \emptyset$, and every $e, n \in \omega$, there is a $d \leq c$ that forces R^n_e.*

The proof of lemma 3.3 is trivial. If $P \neq \emptyset$, then c admits some acceptable part. We simply extend each initial segment of condition c's acceptable parts to satisfy P_m until there exists no acceptable part that has not been extended. Note that after some extension of the initial segments of the other parts, an originally acceptable part may probably become unacceptable. So it is not necessary that all acceptable parts of c are extended.

The next section is devoted to prove lemma 3.4, which clearly follows from the following lemma 3.5.

Lemma 3.5. *Given a requirement R^n_e and a condition $c = (k, \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{k-1}, P)$, let $U(c)$ denote the parts of c that do not force R^n_e. Then, there exists a condition $d = (k', \sigma'_0, \cdots, \sigma'_{k'-1}, Q) \leq c$, $Q \neq \emptyset$, such that $|U(d)| < |U(c)|$.*

Clearly lemma 3.5 implies lemma 3.4 because for a given condition c, one could simply construct a series of conditions $c \geq d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \cdots \geq d_k$, with $|U(d_k)| < |U(d_{k-1})| < \cdots < |U(d_1)| < |U(c)|$. However, this clearly implies $|U(d_k)| = 0$, i.e., $U(d_k) = \emptyset$.

4. Proof of lemma 3.5

In this section, we fix a condition $c = (k, \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{k-1}, P)$ and requirement R^n_e in lemma 3.5. Let $U(c)$ denote parts of c that do not yet force R^n_e.

Definition 4.1.

- We say Φ^ρ_e disagrees with V by time t on X ($X \in 2^\omega \vee X \in 2^{<\omega}$) iff $t \leq |X|$ and there exists Y, $n \in \omega$ such that at least one of the following holds.

(1) $\Phi_e^{((Y\cap X)/(\rho\cap A))}(n)[t]\downarrow \cap V = \emptyset$;
(2) $|\Phi_e^{((Y\cap X)/(\rho\cap A))}(n)[t]\downarrow| > e$;
(3) $\exists \tau \in \Phi_e^{((Y\cap X)/(\rho\cap A))}(n)[t]\downarrow\ |\tau| \neq n$.

- Φ_e^ρ disagrees with V on set X iff there exists t such that $\Phi_e^{\rho\cap X}$ disagrees with V by time t.
- For a clopen set V and a condition $d = (k, \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{k-1}, P)$, let

(4.1)

$$[T_V^d] = \{Z_0, Z_1 \cdots Z_{2k-1} : \exists X_0 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_{k-1} \in P \ (\forall l) X_l = Z_{2l} \cup Z_{2l+1} \text{ and } (\forall l \in U(d))\Phi_e^{\sigma_l \cap A} \text{ does not disagree with } V \text{ on } Z_{2l} \text{ and on } Z_{2l+1}\}$$

We say d does not disagree with V iff $[T_V^d] \neq \emptyset$.

Note that

- for every d, V, $[T_V^d]$ is a Π_1^0 class.
- the set $\{V \subseteq 2^{<\omega} : V \text{ is finite, } c \text{ disagrees with } V\}$ is c.e.

Definition 4.2. For a collection of sets $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, \ldots, V_w\}$, $\mathcal{V}$ is K-disperse iff for all K-partitions of $\{V_1, \cdots, V_w\}$, $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \cdots \cup P_K = \{V_1, \cdots, V_w\}$, there exists $l \leq K$ such that $\bigcap_{V_i \in P_l} V_i = \emptyset$.

For some $J > \max\{|\sigma_i|\}$, let $\tilde{\sigma_i}^J = \sigma_i \underbrace{0 \cdots 0}_{J-|\sigma_i| \text{ times}}$ where σ_i is a component of the condition $c = (k, \sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_k, P)$ fixed at the beginning of this section. Now consider the following conditions, namely, $\tilde{c_J} = (k, \tilde{\sigma_1}^J, \cdots, \tilde{\sigma_k}^J, P)$.

To prove lemma 3.5 we consider the following four cases.

(1) For all m, $J > \max\{|\sigma_i|\}$, $\mathcal{V}_{m,J} = \{V \subseteq 2^m : [T_V^{\tilde{c_J}}] \neq \emptyset\}$ is not $2ke$-disperse. For some $J > \max\{|\sigma_i|\}$, $(\forall s \in \omega)\ Q^n \cap 2^s \in \mathcal{V}_{s,J}$.
(2) For all $J > \max\{|\sigma_i|\}$, $(\exists s \in \omega)\ Q^n \cap 2^s \notin \mathcal{V}_{s,J}$. For all $s \in \omega$, $j \in U(c)$, $X = X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P$, we have $\Phi_e^{\sigma_j}$ does not disagree with $Q^n \cap 2^s$ on $X_j \cap A$.
(3) There exists $s \in \omega$, $j \in U(c)$, $X = X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P$ such that $\Phi_e^{\sigma_j}$ disagrees with $Q^n \cap 2^s$ on $X_j \cap A$.
(4) For some m, $J > \max\{|\sigma_i|\}$, $\mathcal{V}_{m,J} = \{V \subseteq 2^m : [T_V^{\tilde{c_J}}] \neq \emptyset\}$ is $2ke$-disperse.

These four cases clearly cover all possible situations. Actually, case (1) and case (2) are impossible.

We show in lemma 4.3 that if case (3) occurs, then there exists $d \leq c$ with $|U(d)| < |U(c)|$.

We show in lemma 4.4 that in case (1) one could compute a strong enumeration of Q^n, a contradiction.

We show in lemma 4.5 that in case (2) A would be effectively compressible, also a contradiction.

We show in lemma 4.6 that in case (4) there exists $d \leq c$ such that $U(d) = \emptyset$. Therefore the proof is accomplished once these lemmas are established.

Now we begin to address each case.

Lemma 4.3. *If there exists $s \in \omega$, $j \in U(c)$, $X = X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P$ such that $\Phi_e^{\sigma_j}$ disagrees with $Q^n \cap 2^s$ on $X_j \cap A$, then there exists $d \leq c$ with identical number of parts such that d forces R_e^n on part j. Thus, $|U(d)| < |U(c)|$.*

Proof. This is case (3). The condition of this lemma clearly implies that there exists $s \in \omega$, $j \in U(c)$, $X = X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P$, $\tau \subset X_j \cap A$, $n \in \omega$, such that $\Phi_e^{\tau/\sigma_j}(n)\downarrow$, and one of the following three items holds.

(1) $\Phi_e^{\tau/(\sigma_j \cap A)}(n)\downarrow \cap V = \emptyset$;
(2) $|\Phi_e^{\tau/(\sigma_j \cap A)}(n)\downarrow| > e$;
(3) $\exists \gamma \in \Phi_e^{\tau/(\sigma_j \cap A)}(n)\downarrow \ |\gamma| \neq n$.

To construct d, let $Q = \{Y = Y_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Y_k \in P : Y_j/\sigma_j \supseteq (X_j \cap \tau)/\sigma_j\}$. The initial segment of d is obtained by extending σ_j to τ/σ_j while preserving other components of c.

It is clear that $Q \neq \emptyset$ (because $X \in Q$) and Q is a Π_1^0 partition class (because $Q \subseteq P$). It is also clear by the construction of d that $d \leq c$.

Because $\Phi_e^{\tau/(\sigma_j \cap A)}(m)$ halt in time $|\tau|$ and $\tau \subset A$, by convention, for every set X,

$$\Phi_e^{X/(\tau/\sigma_j \ \cap A)}(m)[|\tau|]\downarrow = \Phi_e^{\tau/(\sigma_j \cap A)}(m)[|\tau|]\downarrow$$

Thus, by definition of τ, R_e^n (recall definition 3.1) and by definition 2.5, d forces R_e^n on part j.

□

We now examine the remaining three cases.

Lemma 4.4. *If for all m,$J > \max\{|\sigma_i|\}$, $\mathcal{V}_{m,J} = \{V \subseteq 2^m : [T_V^{c_J}] \neq \emptyset\}$ is not $2ke$-disperse, and for some $J > \max\{|\sigma_i|\}$, $(\forall s)$ $Q^n \cap 2^s \in \mathcal{V}_{s,J}$, then Q^n admits a strong $2ke-$enumeration.*

Proof. This is case (1). We show in the following that if such a J exists, we can compute a strict $2ke$-enumeration of Q^n.

Fix J satisfying condition of this lemma, i.e., $(\forall s)$ $Q^n \cap 2^s \in \mathcal{V}_{s,J}$. Observe that for all collections of sets $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, if $\mathcal{W}$ is $K-$disperse, then $\mathcal{V}$ must be $K-$disperse. Furthermore, $\mathcal{V} = \{V \subseteq 2^{<\omega} : (\exists m \in \omega) V \subseteq 2^m \text{ and } [T_V^{c_J}] \neq \emptyset\}$ is co-c.e. Thus, to obtain a $2ke$-size subset of 2^s that has non-empty intersection with $Q^n \cap 2^s$, we wait for such a time t that $\mathcal{V}[t] \cap \mathcal{P}(2^s)$ is not $2ke-$disperse where for a co-c.e. set W, $W[t]$ is the set computed by time t. Let $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \cdots \cup P_{2ke}$ denote the non-$2ke$-disperse witness partition of $\mathcal{V}[t] \cap \mathcal{P}(2^s)$, i.e., $\bigcup\limits_{j \leq 2ke} P_j = \mathcal{V}[t] \cap \mathcal{P}(2^s)$, $(\forall j \leq 2ke) \bigcap\limits_{V \in P_j} V \neq \emptyset$.

Then, for each $j \leq 2ke$, select one element ρ_j from each $\bigcap\limits_{V \in P_j} V$. Because $Q^n \cap 2^s \in \mathcal{V}_{s,J} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{V}[t]$, at least one of $\rho_j, j \leq 2ke$, is contained in $Q^n \cap 2^s$. Thus, $\{\rho_j\}_{j \leq 2ke}$ is a $2ke$-enumeration of $Q^n \cap 2^s$. Finally, the conclusion follows by noticing that the procedure is uniform in s.

□

Next, we deal with case (2).

Lemma 4.5. *If for all $J > \max\{|\sigma_i|\}$ $(\exists s)$ $Q^n \cap 2^s \notin \mathcal{V}_{s,J}$ and if for all $s \in \omega$, $j \in U(c)$, $X = X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P$, $\Phi_e^{\sigma_j}$ does not disagree with $Q^n \cap 2^s$ on $X_j \cap A$, then A is effectively compressible.*

Proof. The proof concerns the constructibility of Q^n. Given N, we find in the following way a M such that $K_U(A \upharpoonright M) \leq M - N + const$.

To achieve this, for any given $r' > \max_j\{|\sigma_j|\}$, we compute $r > r'$ and a set $W_r^{r'}$ such that $|W_r^{r'}| \geq 2^{r-r'-1}$, $A \upharpoonright_r^{r'} \notin W_r^{r'}$.

To compute such an r, we first prove that there exists time $t > r'$ such that for all $\rho \in 2^{t-r'}$, $X = X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P$, $\tau = \underbrace{0\cdots0}_{r' \text{ times}}\rho$, $\bar{\tau} = \underbrace{0\cdots0}_{r' \text{ times}}\bar{\rho}$, there exists $s \in \omega$, $j \in U(c)$ such that

(1) either $\Phi_e^{\tilde{\sigma_j}^{r'}}$ disagrees with $Q^n[t] \cap 2^s$ on $X_j \cap \tau$ by time t
(2) or $\Phi_e^{\tilde{\sigma_j}^{r'}}$ disagrees with $Q^n[t] \cap 2^s$ on $X_j \cap \overline{\tau}$ by time t.

Suppose on the contrary that such $t > r'$ does not exist. We show that $(\forall s)[T^{\tilde{c}_{r'}}_{Q^n \cap 2^s}] \neq \emptyset$ is thus a contradiction of the condition of this lemma (for all J, $(\exists s)$ $Q^n \cap 2^s \notin \mathcal{V}_{s,J}$). If such a t does not exist, then for any $u > r'$, define the following closed set

(4.2)

$$\begin{aligned} H_u = \{Y \subseteq \omega :& \text{let } \rho = Y \upharpoonright_{u-r'}, \tau = \underbrace{0\cdots0}_{r' \text{ times}}\rho, \bar{\tau} = \underbrace{0\cdots0}_{r' \text{ times}}\bar{\rho}, \\ & \text{there exists } X = X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P \text{such that for all } j \in U(c), s \in \omega \\ & \text{neither } \Phi_e^{\tilde{\sigma_j}^{r'}} \text{ disagrees with } Q^n[u] \cap 2^s \text{on } X_j \cap \tau \text{ by time } u; \\ & \text{nor does } \Phi_e^{\tilde{\sigma_j}^{r'}} \text{ disagrees with } Q^n[u] \cap 2^s \text{ on } X_j \cap \overline{\tau} \text{ by time } u. \ \} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, for all $u \in \omega$, $H_u \supseteq H_{u+1}$, and H_u is effectively closed. Because we have supposed on the contrary that such $t > r'$ does not exist, $(\forall u)H_u \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, there exists $Y \in \bigcap_u H_u$. It is easy to check by the definition of H_u and Y that there exists $X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P$, such that for all $l \in U(c)$, $s \in \omega$, neither does $\Phi_e^{\tilde{\sigma_l}^{r'}}$ disagree with $Q^n \cap 2^s$ on $Y \cap X_l$ nor does $\Phi_e^{\tilde{\sigma_l}^{r'}}$ disagree with $Q^n \cap 2^s$ on $\overline{Y} \cap X_l$. Thus, for all $s \in \omega$, there exists some $Z_1 \oplus Z_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus Z_{2k} \in [T^{\tilde{c}_{r'}}_{Q^n \cap 2^s}]$ where $Z_{2i} = Y \cap X_i$, $Z_{2i-1} = \overline{Y} \cap X_i$. Thus, for all $s \in \omega$, $[T^{\tilde{c}_{r'}}_{Q^n \cap 2^s}] \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction.

Let $r = t$, and let $W_r^{r'}$ denote $\rho \in 2^{r-r'}$ such that the above item (1) holds, i.e., $\rho \in 2^{r-r'}$ such that for some $X = X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P$, $j \in U(c)$, $s \in \omega$, $\Phi_e^{\tilde{\sigma_j}^{r'}}$ disagrees with $Q^n[t] \cap 2^s$ on $\tau \cap X_j$ by time t, where $\tau = \underbrace{0\cdots0}_{r' \text{ times}}\rho$. By the definition of t, for all $\rho \in 2^{r-r'}$, either $\rho \in W_r^{r'}$ or $\overline{\rho} \in W_r^{r'}$. Therefore, $|W_r^{r'}| \geq 2^{r-r'-1}$. It remains to prove that $A \upharpoonright_{r'}^{r} \notin W_r^{r'}$. This is also clear because otherwise, for some $X = X_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X_k \in P$, $j \in U(c)$, $s \in \omega$, $\Phi_e^{\tilde{\sigma_j}^{r'}}$ disagrees with $Q^n[t] \cap 2^s$ on $\underbrace{0\cdots0}_{r' \text{ times}}(X_j \cap A) \upharpoonright_{r'}^{r}$ by time t, which implies that (note that $\tilde{\sigma_j}^J \prec \sigma_j$) $\Phi_e^{\sigma_j}$ disagrees with $Q^n[t] \cap 2^s$ on $X_j \cap A$ by time t, which violates the condition of this lemma.

We have shown a way to compute, for a given $r' > \max\{\sigma_i\}$, a number $r > r'$, a finite set $W \upharpoonright_r^{r'}$ such that $|W \upharpoonright_r^{r'}| \geq 2^{r-r'-1}$, $A \upharpoonright_{r'}^{r} \notin W \upharpoonright_r^{r'}$. To compute M such that $A \upharpoonright_M$ admits Kolmogorov complexity $M - N$, let $r_0 < r_1 < \cdots < r_b \in \omega$, $M = r_b$, be such that for all $1 \leq l \leq b$, $W_{r_l}^{r_{l-1}}$ is defined as above. Therefore, for the set $E = \{\rho \in 2^M\colon (\forall l)\rho \upharpoonright_{r_l}^{r_{l-1}} \notin W_{r_l}^{r_{l-1}}\}$, we have $|E| \leq 2^{M-b}$ but $A \upharpoonright_M \in E$. Therefore, we choose b sufficiently large to ensure $(\forall \rho \in E)K_U(\rho) < M - b + const < M - N$, where *const* only depends on the above algorithm. In particular,

$K_U(A\upharpoonright_M) < M - N$. The conclusion that A is effectively compressible follows by noting that M is computable (essentially by the procedure to compute r from r') from any given N.

□

Case (4) is the key to the proof.

Lemma 4.6. *For any condition $c' = (k, \sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_k, P)$, $P \neq \emptyset$, if there exists a $2ke$-disperse collection $\{V_1, \cdots, V_w\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(2^s)$ such that $(\forall j \leq w)[T^{c'}_{V_j}] \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $d \leq c'$ such that d forces R^n_e.*

Proof. We begin by introducing a set operation $Cross$. For a w number of ordered $2k$-partitions $X^1 \cdots X^w$, where for each m $X^m = X^m_0 \oplus X^m_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus X^m_{2k-1}$, let $\mathcal{K}_0, \mathcal{K}_2 \cdots \mathcal{K}_{2k-1}$, be $2k$ finite collections of subsets of $\{1 \cdots w\}$, i.e., $(\forall K \in \mathcal{K}_i)K \subseteq \{1 \cdots w\}$.

Definition 4.7. Let

$$Cross(X^1, X^2, \cdots X^w; \mathcal{K}_0, \cdots, \mathcal{K}_{2k-1}) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{2k-1} (\bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i} Y_{K,i})$$

where $Y_{K,i} = \bigcap\limits_{m \in K} X^m_i$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_i$.

For w Π^0_1 classes, $S_1, \cdots, S_w$,

(4.3)

$$Cross(S_1, S_2, \cdots, S_w; \mathcal{K}_0, \cdots, \mathcal{K}_{2k-1}) =$$

$$\{Y : (\exists X^j \in S_j) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \cdots, w, s.t.,\ Y = Cross(X^1, X^2, \cdots, X^w; \mathcal{K}_0 \cdots \mathcal{K}_{2k-1})\}$$

It is easy to verify that

Fact 4.8. *For w Π^0_1 classes, $S_1, \cdots, S_w$, $Cross(S_0, S_1, \cdots, S_w; \mathcal{K}_0 \cdots \mathcal{K}_{2k-1})$ is a Π^0_1 class, and if for all $j \leq w$, $S_j \neq \emptyset$, then $Cross(S_0, S_1, \cdots, S_w; \mathcal{K}_0 \cdots \mathcal{K}_{2k-1}) \neq \emptyset$.*

Let

$$\mathcal{K} = \{K \subseteq \{1, \cdots, w\} : \{V_j\}_{j \in K} \text{ is e-disperse}\} \tag{4.4}$$

Let

$$[Q] = Cross(T^{c'}_{V_1}, \cdots, T^{c'}_{V_w}; \mathcal{K}, \cdots, \mathcal{K}) \tag{4.5}$$

By fact 4.8 and fact $(\forall j)[T^{c'}_{V_j} \neq \emptyset]$, we have $Q \neq \emptyset$. It is also obvious that $d = (2k|\mathcal{K}|, \sigma^d, Q) \leq c'$ where σ^d represents the corresponding replication of the initial segment vector of c', i.e., $\sigma^d_j = \sigma_{f(j)}$ with witness $f(j) = j \ mod(2|\mathcal{K}|) + 1$.

We will prove that d forces R^n_e. The key observation is the following:

Fact 4.9. *$[Q]$ is a partition class, i.e., all elements of $[Q]$ code a partition of ω.*

Proof. Assume, on the contrary, that there exists $x \in \omega$ that does not lie in any component of some $W \in [Q]$. Suppose by definition of Cross and Q (see 4.5),

$$W = Cross(X^1, X^2, \cdots, X^w; \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}, \cdots, \mathcal{K})$$

where $X^m \in T^{c'}_{V_m}$. Therefore, $W = \bigoplus\limits_{i \leq 2k} (\bigoplus\limits_{K \in \mathcal{K}} (\bigcap\limits_{m \in K} X^m_i))$.

We will derive a contradiction from $(\forall K \in \mathcal{K}, i \leq 2k)x \notin \bigcap\limits_{m \in K} X^m_i$.

For $l \leq 2k$, let $P_l = \{m \leq w : x \in X_l^m\}$. Note that $P_l, l \leq 2k$ is a $2k-$partition of $\{1, \cdots, w\}$.

It is clear that $P_l \notin \mathcal{K}$ for all l; otherwise, $x \in \bigcap_{m \in P_l} X_l^m$, which is a component of W. Therefore, by definition of $\mathcal{K}$ in 4.4, for all l, there is an e-partition of $\{V_m\}_{m \in P_l}$, namely, $P_{l,0}, P_{l,1} \cdots P_{l,e-1}$ s.t. $(\forall m) \bigcap_{V \in P_{l,m}} V \neq \emptyset$.

In combination with the fact that $P_l, l \leq 2k$ is a $2k-$partition of $\{1, \cdots, w\}$, we have $P_{0,0}, P_{0,1} \cdots P_{0,e-1}, P_{1,0} \cdots P_{1,e-1} \cdots P_{2k-1,e-1}$ is a $2ke$-partition of $\{V_r\}_{r \leq w}$ with $(\forall m, l) \bigcap_{V \in P_{l,m}} V \neq \emptyset$, which contradicts the $2ke$-disperse condition for $\{V_r\}_{r \leq w}$ in lemma 4.6.

□

To see that d forces R_e^n, we observe the following:

Fact 4.10. *For an $e-$disperse sequence of clopen sets $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_w$, if $|\Phi_e(n)\downarrow| \leq e$, then there exists V_i, $\Phi_e(n) \cap V_i = \emptyset$*

Proof. For $\rho \in \Phi_e(n)$, let $\mathcal{V}_\rho = \{V_i : \rho \in V_i\}$. If for all V_i, $\Phi_e(n) \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{V}_\rho$, $\rho \in \Phi_e(n)$, is a $|\Phi_e(n)\downarrow|$ partition of $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_w$, and by the $e-$dispersity of $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_w$, there exists ρ such that $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}_\rho} V = \emptyset$. However, this contradicts the definition of $\mathcal{V}_\rho$, which implies $\rho \in \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}_\rho} V$.

□

Fact 4.11. *If a single Turing functional Φ_e^ρ does not disagree with V on X, then for any $Y \subseteq X$, Φ_e^ρ does not disagree with V on Y.*

The proof follows easily by the definition of disagreement.

Combining fact 4.10 and fact 4.11, we have the following:

Fact 4.12. *For an $e-$disperse sequence of clopen sets $V_1, V_2 \ldots V_w$, if for each $i \leq w$ Φ_e does not disagree with V_i on set X_i, then for any $Y \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^{w} X_w$, Φ_e^Y is not total or is not an $e-$enumeration.*

From this fact, we can prove that d forces R_e^n. For any part l of d, suppose that l corresponds to K, i; we prove that for any $Y \in [Q]$, $Y = \bigoplus_{i \leq 2k-1} (\bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i = \mathcal{K}} Y_{K,i})$. It holds that $\Phi_e^{Y_{K,i}/\sigma_i}$ is not total or is not an $e-$enumeration.

By the definition of Q, suppose that $Y = Cross(X^1, \cdots, X^w; \mathcal{K}, \cdots, \mathcal{K})$, $Y_{K,i} = \bigcap_{r \in K} X_i^r$, where $X^m \in [T_{V_m}^{c'}]$, $X^m = X_0^m \oplus X_1^m \oplus \cdots \oplus X_{2k-1}^m$, $\bigoplus_{i \leq k} X_{2i-1}^m \cup X_{2i+1}^m \in P$, and P is the Π_1^0 class component of condition c'.

By the definition of $T_V^{c'}$, $\Phi_e^{\sigma_i}$ does not disagree with V_r on set X_i^r for all $r \leq w$. By the definition of $K \in \mathcal{K}$, $\{V_r\}_{r \in K}$ is a set of $e-$disperse clopen sets. Thus, by fact 4.12, $\Phi_e^{Y_{K,i}/\sigma_i}$ is either non-total or is not an $e-$enumeration.

Thus, lemma 4.6 follows. □

Remark 4.13.

Lemma 4.5 makes use of the fact that $[Q^n]$ is a Π_1^0 class, while in [8], Q^n can be arbitrary.

As usual, there is an oracle version of the theorem 1.3 that also holds.

References

1. K. Ambos-Spies, B. Kjos-Hanssen, S. Lempp, and T.A. Slaman, *Comparing DNR and WWKL*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **69** (2004), no. 4, 1089–1104.
2. R. Beigela, H. Buhrmanb, P. Fejerc, L. Fortnowd, P. Grabowskie, L. Longpréf, A. Muchnikg, F. Stephanh, and L. Torenvlieti, *Enumerations of the Kolmogorov function*, Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (2004), TR04–015.
3. Chitat Chong, Theodore Slaman, and Yue Yang, *The metamathematics of stable ramseys theorem for pairs*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **27** (2014), no. 3, 863–892.
4. B. Kjos-Hanssen, *Infinite subsets of random sets of integers*, Math. Res. Lett **16** (2009), no. 1, 103–110.
5. ———, *A strong law of computationally weak subsets*, Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (2010).
6. Manuel Lerman, Reed Solomon, and Henry Towsner, *Separating principles below ramsey's theorem for pairs*, Journal of Mathematical Logic **13** (2013), no. 02, 1350007.
7. Jiayi Liu, RT^2_2 *does not imply* WKL_0, Journal of Symbolic Logic **77** (2012), no. 2, 609–620.
8. Lu Liu, *Cone avoiding closed sets*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **367** (2015), no. 3, 1609–1630.
9. Joseph S Miller, *Extracting information is hard: a turing degree of non-integral effective hausdorff dimension*, Advances in Mathematics **226** (2011), no. 1, 373–384.
10. Ludovic Patey, *Iterative forcing and hyperimmunity in reverse mathematics*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.07709 (2015).
11. Wei Wang, *The definability strength of combinatorial principles, 2014. to appear.*

E-mail address: g.jiayi.liu@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha, 410083, China